

VOLUME 6. Part 6
pp. 161-192

COMMONWEALTH INSTITUTE OF APPLIED SCIENCE
PARANITROPHENOL (MELANITROGEN)
WINCHES PARK
BPS. HATFIELD 22nd May 1952
ST. ALBANS, HERTS

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

22 MAY 1952

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

| <i>Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology :</i> | Page |
|---|------|
| Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the <i>Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature</i> | 161 |
| Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases | 161 |

(continued on back wrapper)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1952

Price Ten shillings
(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President: Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President: (*Vacant*)

Vice-President and Acting President: Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.) (*President*) (1st January 1944)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)

Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)

Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary: Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist: Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Registrar: Mr. A. S. Pankhurst

Publications Officer: Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission: 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust: 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 6, Part 6 (pp. 161-192)

22nd May 1952

LODOVICO DI CAPORACCO

It is with the greatest regret that the death is announced of Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco, the Italian Representative on the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature since 1939.

An Obituary Notice will be published as soon as possible.

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (vol. 6, Part 6) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers is involved in

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*).

applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Vol. 6, Part 6) in relation to the following names :—

- (1) All names in Linnaeus, 1776, *Catalogue of the Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects, Plants, etc., contained in Edwards's Natural History* (Z.N.(S.) 649).
- (2) *Chortoicetes* Brunner, 1893, and *Austroicetes* Uvarov, 1925 (Class Insecta, Order Orthoptera) (Z.N.(S.)595).
- (3) *Mortonella* Pomel, 1883 (Class Scaphopoda) (Z.N.(S.)639).

2. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the journals "Nature" and "Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature.*

28, Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

22nd May 1952.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES THE NAMES BY LINNAEUS PUBLISHED IN 1776 IN THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "A CATALOGUE OF THE BIRDS, BEASTS, FISHES, INSECTS, PLANTS, ETC. CONTAINED IN EDWARDS'S NATURAL HISTORY "

Application submitted by THE COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)649)

(Application dated 3rd April 1951)

The Committee on Nomenclature, of the Scientific Staff of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, is of the opinion that the best interests of zoological nomenclature will be served by declaring the following publication to be eliminated from consideration as respects its systematic names as of this publication and date: Linnaeus, *A Catalogue of the Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects, Plants, etc. contained in Edwards's Natural History*, in seven volumes, London, 1776.

Mont A. Cazier
Edwin H. Colbert
Norman D. Newell
George H. H. Tate
John T. Zimmer (*Chairman*)

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAMES "CHORTOICETES" BRUNNER, 1893, AND "AUSTROICETES" UVAROV, 1925 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER ORTHOPTERA), AND TO DIRECT THAT THESE NAMES BE TREATED AS OF THE FEMININE GENDER

By K. H. L. KEY, D.Sc.

(*Division of Entomology, Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organization, Canberra, Australia*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)595)

1. The nominal genus *Chortoicetes* Brunner, 1893 (*Ann. Mus. Stor. nat. Genova* 33: 123) was established to include "species Asiaticae, Africanae et Australicae," none of which was cited by name. The first author to refer a nominal species to this genus was Brancsik, who in 1896 so referred the new nominal

species *Chortoicetes yorkei* Brancsik, 1896 (*Jh. Naturw. Ver. (Mus Ver.) Trencsin* 17-18 : 249). Kirby (1910 : *Syn. Cat. Orth.* 3 (2) : 194) showed that this is a subjective synonym of *Epacromia terminifera* Walker, 1870 (*Cat. Derm. Salt. Br. Mus.* 4 : 777), which he formally selected as the type species of *Chortoicetes*. The nominal genus *Austroicetes* Uvarov, 1925 (*Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.* 1924 : 271) was established to contain certain species formerly placed in *Chortoicetes*, with *Epacromia pusilla* Walker, 1870 (*Cat. Derm. Salt. Br. Mus.* 4 : 778) as type species by original designation.

2. The names *Chortoicetes* and *Austroicetes* are based upon the Greek word *oiketes*, an inhabitant (Brunner, *loc. cit.*). According to section F of the Appendix to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, the Greek *oi* is to be transliterated as *oe*. Under the interpretation of Article 19 agreed upon by the International Commission and adopted by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 142), failure to follow the rules of transliteration given in the Appendix constitutes in certain circumstances an "error of transcription." If this ruling were to apply to the present case it would thus involve the emendation of the universally accepted original orthography of *Chortoicetes* to "*Chortoeetes*," and of *Austroicetes* to "*Austroeeetes*." Further, *oiketes* is masculine, so that, especially in the light of the provisions adopted by the Thirteenth Congress for determining the gender of generic names (see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 248), strict application of the rules would require both of the names in question to take that gender. According to Article 14 of the Code, adjectival trivial names must agree in gender with the generic name, and provisions adopted by the Thirteenth Congress (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 68) make it clear that, under the amended rules, names formed in contravention of that Article are to be automatically corrected. Now the names *Chortoicetes* and *Austroicetes* have almost always been treated as feminine. Only Rehn (1907 : *Chortoicetes pusillulus*) and Uvarov (1930 : *Austroicetes pusillus*) have combined them with trivial names in the masculine form, and Uvarov elsewhere uses "*Chortoicetes terminifera*" and "*Austroicetes pusilla*." Strict application of the new rules would thus involve the emendation of a number of specific trivial names in the two genera.

3. Two of the species whose names would thus have to be emended, both as to the orthography of the generic name and the gender of the trivial name, are those long known under the names *Chortoicetes terminifera* Walker (the type species of *Chortoicetes*) and *Austroicetes cruciata* Saussure. These are the two most serious acridid pests of Australia; a considerable literature has developed around both of them, extending back, in the first, to 1900, and in the second, to 1938. There can be no question but that a strict application of the rules to the names of these species would cause confusion and resentment, and would tend to bring the International Code, as well as the practice of taxonomy, into disrepute among zoologists in Australia. As against these disadvantages, it is difficult to see that any compensating useful result could accrue from the changes.

4. In view of the fact that, under the present proposal if approved, the International Commission will in any case need to use its plenary powers in connection with the generic name *Chortoicetes* Brunner, I consider that the economic importance of this genus and of the species *Epacromia terminifera* Walker, 1870, is such that, in the interest of nomenclatorial stability and to prevent any future misunderstanding, it is desirable that the Commission should use the foregoing powers also for the purpose of designating the above species as the type species of this genus in place of the subjectively identical but later established nominal species *Chortoicetes yorketownensis* Brancsik, 1896.

5. For the reasons set out above, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

- (1) to use its plenary powers :
 - (a) to validate the generic names *Chortoicetes* Brunner, 1893, and *Austroicetes* Uvarov, 1925, in their original orthography ;
 - (b) to direct that the generic names *Chortoicetes* Brunner, 1893, and *Austroicetes* Uvarov, 1925, are both to be treated as being of the feminine gender ;
 - (c) to set aside all type designations or selections for *Chortoicetes* Brunner, 1893, made prior to the decision now proposed to be taken and to designate *Epacromia terminifera* Walker, 1870 to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;
- (2) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;
 - (a) *Chortoicetes* Brunner von Wattenwyl, 1893 (type species, by designation as proposed in (1) (c) above under the plenary powers : *Epacromia terminifera* Walker, 1870) (gender of generic name : feminine, as proposed to be so declared under (1) (b) above) ;
 - (b) *Austroicetes* Uvarov, 1925 (type species, by original designation : *Epacromia pusilla* Walker, 1870) (gender of generic name : feminine, as proposed to be so declared in (1) (b) above) ;
- (3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;
 - (a) *terminifera* Walker, 1870 (as published in the binominal combination *Epacromia terminifera*) (trivial name of type species of *Chortoicetes* Brunner von Wattenwyl, 1893) ;
 - (b) *pusilla* Walker, 1870 (as published in the binominal combination *Epacromia pusilla*) (trivial name of type species of *Austroicetes* Uvarov, 1925).

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE NAME
"CHORTOICETES" BRUNNER, 1893 (CLASS INSECTA,
ORDER ORTHOPTERA) SUBMITTED BY DR. K. H. L. KEY**

By H. G. ANDREWARTHA

(University of Adelaide, Waite Agricultural Research Institute, Adelaide, South Australia)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)595)

(Letter dated 22nd November, 1952)

I have read a copy of an application, which I understand will be submitted to you by Dr. K. H. L. Key, asking your Commission to exercise its plenary powers to prevent confusion in the nomenclature of species of the genera *Chortoicetes* and *Austroicetes*. I would like to take this opportunity of supporting Dr. Key's application.

I worked for a number of years, studying the ecology and general biology of two of the species concerned, namely, *Chortoicetes terminifera* and *Austroicetes cruciata*, and have published a number of papers on this subject. I feel therefore that I am in a good position to appreciate the argument which Dr. Key has advanced in his application to your Commission, and I would like to add my full and strong support for his application.

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR.
K. H. L. KEY, RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAMES
"CHORTOICETES" BRUNNER, 1893, AND "AUSTROI-
CETES" UVAROV, 1925 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER
ORTHOPTERA)**

By D. C. SWAN

(Waite Agricultural Research Institute, Department of Entomology, Adelaide, South Australia)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)595)

(Letter dated 17th January 1952)

You have, I believe, received recently from Dr. K. H. L. Key a communication for submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature concerning the status of the generic names *Chortoicetes* and *Austroicetes* and asking that these be validated in their original orthography and as being of feminine gender.

Dr. Key has asked me whether I was prepared to support these proposals and if so to write to you in your capacity as Secretary of the Commission. This I am glad to do for the reasons that follow. Each genus contains a species of considerable economic importance in South Australia and, indeed, widely in Australia.

C. terminifera is the Australian plague locust, while *A. cruciata* is the Plague Grasshopper. Their distributions in Australia overlap completely and each species tends to swarm independently. Their superficial resemblances in the field have caused much confusion among farmers and administrators as to the efficiency of control measures due to apparent rapid recurrence (which may be in fact an appearance of the other species) and so on. An extensive research programme by the respective organizations of Key and his associates, and ourselves, from 1934 onwards,

has defined the position precisely, and the names of the two insects and their relative standing, one as a sedentary swarming grasshopper, the other as a migrating locust, have become well known throughout Australia.

It would, I think, create great confusion among the large group of non-biologists who now understand and use the names *Chortoicetes* and *Austroicetes*, if these and the relevant specific trivial names should be modified in conformity with Article 19 of the Rules. I would like therefore to support as strongly as possible the submission of Dr. Key on this matter.

**ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO
SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "AJAX" LINNAEUS,
1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO
AJAX") (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)**

By AUSTIN H. CLARK

(Smithsonian Institution, U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)192)

(Letter dated 28th May, 1951)

Pray put me down as heartily in favor of suppressing the name (*Papilio*) *ajax* Linnaeus, 1758. With all due respect to the late Dr. Corbet I believe that he was in error in assuming that the name *ajax* was based on what we now know as *Papilio xuthus*.

In the original description "P.E. alis obtuse caudatis concoloribus fuscis: fasciis flavescens angulo ani fulvo" the one really diagnostic feature is expressed by "*alis obtuse caudatis*."

This cannot apply to *xuthus*, but does apply to specimens of what we know as *P. cresphontes* (see *Bull. U.S. Nat. Mus.* 157: pl. 31, fig. 1). The rest of the description and the locality also fit *P. cresphontes*. Furthermore, the name *ajax*, the powerful and handsome son of Telemon, would be quite appropriate for the largest of North American butterflies.

P. L. S. Müller (1775, vol. 5: pl. 17, fig. 3) figures *P. thoas* under the name "Das Gelbfeld, *Papilio ajax*" and other early authors figured *thoas* under the name *ajax*.

I am quite convinced that the Linnean name *ajax* refers to *P. cresphontes*. But I am not suggesting that *ajax* replace *cresphontes*. I am bringing this to your attention merely to emphasise the desirability of suppressing the name *ajax*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS "MORTONELLA" POMEL, 1883 (CLASS ECHINOIDEA), A GENUS BASED UPON A MISIDENTIFIED TYPE SPECIES, THE SPECIES INTENDED AS SUCH BY THE ORIGINAL AUTHOR

By J. WYATT DURHAM

(University of California, Department of Paleontology, Berkeley,
California, U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)639)

1. The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers, under the procedure laid down by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 158-159), for the purpose of designating, as the type species of the genus *Mortonella* Pomel, 1883 (Class Echinoidea), a genus based upon a misidentified type species, the species intended to be the type species by the original author of the genus. A decision on this case is urgently required in connection with the preparation of the forthcoming *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, and it is particularly hoped, therefore, that the International Commission will give all practicable priority to the consideration of this case.

2. The facts of this case are as follows. In 1858 (*Syn. Echin. foss.* : 23) Desor established a new nominal genus to which he gave the name *Mortonia*. Desor placed in this genus one species only, which is, therefore, the type species by monotypy. That species was cited by Desor as *Mortonia rogersi* Morton (= *Scutella rogersi* Morton, 1834, *Syn. organ. Remains cret.* : 77, pl. 13, fig. 3). It is perfectly clear that the species to which Desor applied the above name was not the true *Scutella rogersi* Morton, 1834, but the quite distinct species *Scutella quinquefaria* Say, 1825 (*J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* (1) **5** : 228), which already in 1841 (*Mon. echinoid.*, Sec. Mon. des Scutelles : 85, pl. 19a, figs. 1-4) had been misidentified by Agassiz with Morton's *Scutella rogersi*. That the same misidentification was made by Desor in 1858 is clear (a) from the diagnosis (reading in part "sillons ambulacraires de la face inférieure anastomosés deux fois"—, (b) from his reference to Agassiz' figures, and (c) from his description (reading in part "cinq tubes buccaux venant s'ouvrir sur le pourtout du peristome") which he gave for the single included species, a description which is appropriate for *Scutella quinquefaria* Say but is quite unsuitable for *Scutella rogersi* Morton, which has unbranched ambulacral food grooves and no apparent buccal tubes.

3. In 1883 (*Class. méth. gén. Échin. viv. foss.* : 70) Pomel recognised that the name *Mortonia* Desor, 1858, was invalid, it being a junior homonym of *Mortonia* Gray [1851] (*Proc. zool. Sec. Lond.* **19** : 38), and he accordingly gave to Desor's *Mortonia* the new name *Mortonella*.

4. Clark and Twitchell (1915, *U.S. Geol. Survey, Mon.* **54**: 136-138) were the first authors to recognise that two species had hitherto been confused under the name "*Scutella rogersi* Morton." They accordingly separated these two species in their monograph, placing the species which Agassiz (1841) and Desor (1858) had misidentified as *Scutella rogersi* Morton in the genus *Mortonella* Pomel, and the true *Scutella rogersi* Morton in the genus *Clypeaster* Berthold, 1827.

5. All systematists who have recognised the genus *Mortonella* Pomel (*Mortonia* Desor) have treated it in the sense of Desor, that is, as a genus having as its type species the species for which the proper name is *Scutella quinquefaria* Say, 1825.

6. If it were necessary under the *Règles* to assume that Desor's determination of *Scutella rogersi* Morton was correct, the genus *Mortonella* Pomel, auct. would be left without a name, while the name *Mortonella* Pomel (*Mortonia* Desor) would be applicable to a clypeastroid echinoid, in a sense in which it has never been used by any systematist. Such action would run directly counter to Desor's intentions and would be open to the strongest objection, in that it would involve the acceptance as the type species of this genus of a species agreeing neither with the original generic diagnosis nor with Desor's description of the sole species included by him in the genus.

7. The generic name *Mortonella* Pomel (*Mortonia* Desor) has been widely used by systematists (see Mortensen, 1948, *Mon. Echinoidea* **4**(2): 391) who have considered the Tertiary echinoids of the South-eastern United States, for the species figured (incorrectly) by Agassiz (1841) as *Scutella rogersi* Morton and its relatives, and it has never been used in any other sense. Consequently, confusion rather than uniformity would result if it were now necessary to assume that Desor correctly identified Morton's species.

8. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore now asked:—

- (1) under the procedure prescribed by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology for determining the type species of a genus based upon a misidentified type species, to use its plenary powers (a) to set aside all designations or selections of type species for the genus *Mortonella* Pomel, 1883, made prior to the proposed decision, and (b) to designate *Scutella quinquefaria* Say, 1825, to be the type species of the foregoing genus;
- (2) to place the generic name *Mortonella* Pomel, 1883 (gender of generic name: feminine) (type species, as proposed in (1) above to be designated under the plenary powers: *Scutella quinquefaria* Say, 1825) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*;
- (3) to place the trivial name *quinquefaria* Say, 1825 (as published in the combination *Scutella quinquefaria*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*;
- (4) to place the generic name *Mortonia* Desor, 1858 (a junior homonym of *Mortonia* Gray [1852], on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

**OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED EMENDATION TO
"RHANTUS" OF THE NAME "RANTUS" DEJEAN, 1833
(CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)**

By W. A. F. BALFOUR-BROWNE

(*Collin, Dumfries, Scotland*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)171)

(Extract from a letter dated 11th June 1951)

I have just seen in the 11th May *Science* your notice of proposed suspensions of the Rules, and among the generic names mentioned I see *Rantus*. I have not got any previous literature on this subject but, if the suggestion is that the spelling is to be changed to *Rhantus*, I hope that the Commission will not approve that proposal. The rule states that the original spelling is the correct one, and "*Rantus*" is the original spelling.

**SUPPORT FOR MR. R. B. BENSON'S PROPOSALS FOR
THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE
GENERIC NAMES "ACANTHOLYDA" COSTA, 1894 (CLASS
INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA) AND "ACANTHOC-
NEMA" BECKER, 1894 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)**

By R. LAMBERT and O. PECK

(*Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)175)

(Letter dated 13th October 1951)

On page 46 of volume 2 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, Mr. R. B. Benson sets forward reasons for conserving the generic name *Acantholyda* Costa, and the name *Acanthocnema* Becker in Diptera. The proposed preservation of these names with its related details are approved by the undersigned upon the basis of Mr. Benson's reasoning. However, it should be noted that the pertinent Costa articles have not been available to us.

Your attention should be drawn to an error by Benson in his statement of the selection of the type species of *Acantholyda* Costa by Rohwer. While Rohwer did mention the name of the type species in 1911 (*Tech. Ser. U.S. Bur. Ent.* **20** : 73), as stated by Benson, yet this was antedated in his paper in 1910 (*Can. Ent.* **42** : 220). The latter publication was mailed on 4th June, according to a statement on page 220 of that volume.

R. LAMBERT

O. PECK

Systematic Entomology (Hymenoptera)

ON THE CORRECT NAME FOR THE YELLOW RATTLE-
SNAKE FROM THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

By ROBERT MERTENS

(Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)176)

(Note dated 24th October 1951)

Im Gegensatz zu der von Woodbury & Smith (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6, Part 4, pag. 102, 1951) geäußerten Ansicht, dass *decolor* Klauber, 1930, der korrekte Name für die im Titel bezeichnete Klapperschlange ist, stehe ich auf dem Standpunkte, dass dieses Tier als *concolor* Woodbury, 1929, zu bezeichnen ist. Ich vertrete die Ansicht, dass *concolor* Jan, 1859, als *nomen nudum* keine Rechtskraft dadurch erlangt hat, dass es von einem späteren Autor (Notestein 1905) zu einem Synonym von *Crotalus horridus* L. erklärt worden ist; *concolor* Woodbury, 1929, wird also durch eine eindeutige Synonymisierung des *nomen nudum concolor* Jan nicht präokkupiert. Eine nähere Begründung dieser Ansicht findet man bei Stresemann & Mayr, *Senckenbergiana* 32, Nr. 1/4, pag. 211-218, 1951.

SUPPORT FOR PROFESSOR H. E. VOKES' PROPOSAL
RELATING TO THE NAME "MYTILUS" LINNAEUS, 1758
(CLASS PELECYPODA)

By R. Ph. DOLLFUS

(Laboratoire d'Helminthologie Coloniale et de Parasitologie Comparée, Muséum
National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)193)

(Note dated 25th June 1951)

Je suis pour la conservation de *Mytilus* Linnaeus, 1758, espèce type : *Mytilus edulis* Linnaeus, 1758).

SUPPORT FOR PROFESSOR H. E. VOKES' PROPOSAL
RELATING TO THE NAME "MYTILUS" LINNAEUS, 1758
(CLASS PELECYPODA)

By GILBERT RANSON

(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)193)

(Note received 31st July 1951)

Je suis tout à fait d'accord avec H. E. Vokes (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 31-32), pour que *Mytilus edulis* Linnaeus, 1758, soit considéré comme l'espèce type du genre *Mytilus* Linnaeus.

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE
NAMES "TITANIA," "DORILAS," "TENDIPES," "PHILIA,"
AND "TYLOS," ALL OF MEIGEN, 1800 (CLASS INSECTA,
ORDER DIPTERA)**

By CHARLES P. ALEXANDER

(University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., U.S.A.)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)197, 221, 469, 498, 501)

(Letter dated 8th October 1951)

I have noted the suggestions in various publications regarding the proposed suspension of the rules in various cases. The notice to which I refer specifically is in *THE ENTOMOLOGIST*, July, 1951, pp. 164-165.

As a dipterist, I would like to vote upon the five names that you mention; that is, *Titania*, *Dorilas*, *Tendipes*, *Philia*, and *Tylos*. In all cases I vote most strongly in favor of the 1803 names, which in all but one case are also by Meigen. I feel that these longer used names—*Chlorops*, *Pipunculus*, *Chironomus*, *Dilophus* and *Micropeza*—should be retained. It has been argued that a great injustice has been done to Meigen by ignoring the 1800 names. I can never see the justice of such an argument, since, as is well known, Meigen was the first to ignore his 1800 names and replace them with the better known ones in 1803. If the final ruling of the Commission is to recognise the 1803 names in preference to the 1800 ones, I believe that it would establish a precedent whereby all of the (to me) obnoxious 1800 names proposed by Meigen could be discarded. There can be little question that for the past 40 years the recognition of these 1800 names has caused vast confusion. All during my entomological life we have been faced with this situation, and it is greatly to be regretted that firm steps were not taken in the matter some 40 years ago.

**SUGGESTED SUPPRESSION OF THE NAMES IN MEIGEN'S
"NOUVELLE CLASSIFICATION DES MOUCHES À DEUX
AILES" OF 1800 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)**

By EDWARD L. COHER

(University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)191)

(Letter dated 11th October, 1951)

As a worker in several of the groups which are affected by use of Meigen's "1800 paper," I would like to make my feelings on the subject known.

I think all objections to the above-named paper are on file and bear little need of repetition by myself. I am very much in favor of suppression of the paper under discussion (1800) and I hope that such action will be forthcoming to prevent further confusion in the literature.

I realise that this is a grave problem and am making my opinion known only after studying literature on the subject and discussing it with persons who have taken both *pro* and *con* stands on this vexatious question.

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL THAT THE GENERIC
NAME "TYLOS" LATREILLE, 1826 (CLASS CRUSTACEA,
ORDER ISOPODA) SHOULD BE PRESERVED AS AGAINST
"TYLOS" MEIGEN, 1800 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIP-
TERA)**

By T. HEROLD

(*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)501)

(Letter dated 11th October 1951)

Ich bitte zu entschuldigen, dass ich aus Zeitmangel erst heute auf die Nomenklatur-Angelegenheit *Tylos* zurückkomme. Vom Standpunkt der Isopoden-Bearbeiter aus sähe ich im Fortfall der Genusbezeichnung *Tylos* eine sehr erhebliche Schwierigkeit. Seit 1826 ist dieser Genusname unbeanstandet benutzt worden und es gibt kein Synonym, das man als Ersatz vorschlagen könnte. Der Name *Tylos* ist nicht nur fortgesetzt von allen Isopoden-Spezialisten gebraucht worden, sondern ist auch vielfach in die Literatur über die Tierwelt der Höhlen übergegangen. Eine Änderung der Bezeichnung des Isopodengenus *Tylos* würde zweifellos erhebliche Verwirrung anrichten. Vom Standpunkt des Isopoden-Spezialisten aus trete ich daher trotz der Priorität der Dipterengattungsbezeichnung unbedingt für Beibehaltung der Bezeichnung *Tylos* Latreille, 1826, ein.

**SUPPORT FOR PROFESSOR A. VANDEL'S PROPOSAL
FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO PRESERVE
THE GENERIC NAME "TYLOS" (LATREILLE MS.)
AUDOUIN, [1826] (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER ISOPODA)**

By I. GORDON, D.Sc., Ph.D.

(*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)501)

(Extract from a letter dated 29th October 1951)

I would like to support Professor A. Vandel in pleading for the retention of the generic name *Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin, [1826] (Class Crustacea, Order Isopoda).

PROPOSITION EN FAVEUR DU MAINTIEN DU NOM DE " TYLOS " (LATREILLE MS.) AUDOUIN 1825 (CRUSTACEA ; ISOPODA TERRESTRIA)

par A. VANDEL

(Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse, France)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)501)

(Enclosure to letter dated 22nd November 1951)

Position du Problème

Une discussion s'est élevée entre les entomologistes adonnés à l'étude des Diptères au sujet du choix qui s'impose entre les deux synonymes : *Tylos* Meigen, 1800, et *Micropeza* Meigen, 1803. Les carcinologistes n'ont pas à prendre parti dans ce débat. Mais, L. B. HOLTHUIS (1951) et moi-même (VANDEL, 1951) avons fait remarquer que l'adoption du terme de *Tylos* pour désigner un Diptère entraînerait l'abandon du nom de *Tylos* Audouin, conséquence des plus regrettables, car le nom de *Tylos* est universellement adopté pour désigner un grand genre d'Isopodes terrestres. Les carcinologistes ont de solides raisons de demander le maintien du terme de *Tylos*, ainsi qu'il ressort des remarques suivantes.

Historique du terme "Tylos" Audouin

Le terme de *Tylos*, en tant que dénomination appliquée à un Crustacé, apparaît dans la livraison relative aux Crustacés, parue dans la "Description de l'Egypte," et rédigée par Jean-Victor Audouin. Reproduisons la phrase dans laquelle figure l'acte de naissance du nom de *Tylos* (1ère édit., p. 96 ; 2ème édit., pp. 285-286) : "M. Savigny avait sans doute l'intention d'établir un nouveau genre avec cette espèce qui se distingue essentiellement des cloportes, des porcellions et des armadilles, par des caractères fort tranchés. M. Latreille qui possède un individu identique, avait apprécié à leur juste valeur les divers traits de son organisation, et il s'était décidé depuis longtemps à en faire un genre distinct sous le nom de *Tylos*, que nous adoptons, en reconnaissant que M. Savigny a, de son côté, développé avec la plus grande exactitude tous ses caractères, dans les nombreuses figures qu'on a sous les yeux." C'est donc à LATREILLE que nous devons le nom de *Tylos*, encore qu'il n'apparaisse qu'en 1829, dans les publications du grand entomologiste français (LATREILLE, 1829, p. 141). Il convient donc de désigner ce genre de la façon suivante:

Tylos (Latreille MS.) Audouin 1825.

Date de parution de l'ouvrage de Jean-Victor Audouin

La date de cet ouvrage est difficile à fixer en toute certitude. Les planches gravées par les soins de J. C. Savigny portent la mention "dessiné et gravé en 1805-1812." Mais, l'explication des planches, due à J.-V. Audouin est bien postérieure. La seule date officielle qui apparaisse dans l'ouvrage est la lettre du Ministre de l'Intérieur confiant la rédaction de l'explication des planches de J. C. Savigny à J. V. Audouin ; cette lettre est datée du 19 mars 1825. Il convient, à mon sens, de s'en tenir à la date de 1825 qui est la seule à n'être point conjecturale.

C. D. SHERBORN (1897, p. 287) a soutenu que la livraison des Crustacés (ainsi que les autres livraisons qui constituent la Quatrième partie du Tome premier) date de 1826. C'est la même date qui figure dans le "Catalogue of the Library of the British Museum—Natural History." Il convient cependant de remarquer que l'adoption de l'année 1826 comme date de parution de l'ouvrage de J.-V. Audouin ne repose sur aucune donnée vérifiable, et qu'il est tout à fait exagéré d'affirmer que ce volume "may be safely regarded as dated 1826." L'argumentation de SHERBORN se fonde sur une citation parue dans les "Annales de la Société Entomologique de France," t. XI, 1842, p. 99. Si l'on se reporte à cette référence, on constate

qu'elle se rapporte à une notice due à la plume de M. DUPONCHEL et consacrée à la vie et aux travaux de Jean-Victor Audouin. La phrase à laquelle SHERBORN fait allusion, est la suivante : " En 1826, le gouvernement voulant enfin terminer le grand ouvrage sur l'expédition d'Egypte, ce fut encore M. Audouin que l'Administration du Muséum désigna au ministre de l'instruction publique pour donner l'explication des planches relatives aux mollusques et aux animaux articulés, dont l'infortuné M. Savigny n'avait pas eu le temps de rédiger le texte avant de devenir aveugle." Or, il est manifeste que la date de 1826 mentionnée dans cette phrase résulte d'une erreur du biographe. La lettre du Ministre de l'Intérieur (et non du Ministre de l'Instruction Publique comme l'écrit DUPONCHEL) est datée du 19 mars 1825. Le choix de J.-V. Audouin par l'administration du Muséum ne peut donc qu'être antérieure à la décision du Ministre et à la lettre dans laquelle il la notifie.

En conclusion, *il me paraît que c'est l'année 1825, et non l'année 1826, qui doit être retenue comme date de publication de l'ouvrage de J.-V. Audouin.*

Pour être complet, signalons que dans la seconde édition de l'ouvrage (édition in 4^e), la livraison relative à l'explication des planches de Crustacés fait partie du Tome XXII ; elle est datée de 1827. Le volume de planches correspondant est daté de 1826.

Etymologie et genre du terme de "Tylos"

Tylos vient du mot grec Τύλος (callosité, bosse). Ce nom est masculin.

Espèce type du genre "Tylos"

L'espèce type du genre *Tylos* est incontestablement :—

Tylos latreillei Audouin, 1825

(= *Tylos armadillo* Latreille, 1829).

Le terme de "Tylos" reconnu par tous les carcinologistes

Depuis la date de son institution, *c'est à dire depuis cent vingt-cinq ans*, le terme de *Tylos* a été adopté par tous les carcinologistes. Il serait hors de proportion avec l'étendue de cette note de recenser tous les auteurs qui ont fait usage de ce terme. STEBBING (1910, p. 227), et plus récemment, HOLTHUIS (1951, p. 128) en ont dressé des listes assez complètes auxquelles je me permets de renvoyer le lecteur.

Il est peu de termes génériques s'appliquant à des Isopodes qui aient été reconnus de façon si constante et si universelle et dont la synonymie soit aussi brève. L. KOCH (1856, p. 422) a donné à *Tylos latreillei* le nom de *Rhacodes inscriptus*; mais, ce terme, révélateur d'une profonde ignorance de la bibliographie isopodologique, est, aussitôt que né, tombé en désuétude.

Subdivisions systématiques tirant leur dénomination du terme de "Tylos"

MILNE-EDWARDS (1840, p. 186) a créé la "division des Tylosiens" pour le seul genre *Tylos*. J. DANA (1852, p. 301 ; 1853, p. 715) a, dans le même but, institué la sous-famille des "*Tylinæ*." Enfin, BUDE-LUND (1885, p. 272) a élevé cette coupure systématique au rang de famille ; il la nomme "*Tylides*." Sous le nom plus correct de *Tylidae*, cette famille a été reconnue par tous les carcinologistes modernes.

Conclusion

En conclusion, une unanimité, rarement atteinte en zoologie systématique, a depuis cent vingt-cinq ans consacré le terme de *Tylos* qui est adopté par tous les carcinologistes.

Propositions présentées devant la Commission de Nomenclature

La Commission de Nomenclature, agissant en vertu des pleins pouvoirs qui lui ont été délégués, décide :

- (1) (a) de supprimer le nom générique *Tylos* Meigen 1800, *Nouv. Class. Mouches* : 31 ;

- (b) de valider le nom générique *Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin 1825, *Descript. Egypte*; 1ère Edit., I (4): 96 (espèce typique par monotypie: *Tylos latreillei* Audouin 1825, *Descript. Egypte*, 1ère Edit., I (4): 97). Genre du terme: masculin.
- (2) d'insérer dans l'*Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* le nom de *Tylos* Audouin 1825, validé in (I) (b);
- (3) d'insérer dans l'*Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*, le nom de *Tylos* Meigen, 1800, supprimé in (I) (a);
- (4) d'insérer dans l'*Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* le nom de *latreillei* Audouin 1825, comme publié dans la combinaison binominale *Tylos latreillei*.

Bibliographie

- AUDOUIN (J. V.).—1825. Explication sommaire des Planches de Crustacés de l'Égypte et de la Syrie, publiées par Jules-César Savigny, Membre de l'Institut, offrant un exposé des caractères naturels des genres, avec la distinction des espèces, par Victor Audouin.—in *Description de l'Égypte ou Recueil des Observations et des Recherches* qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l'Expédition de l'Armée française publié par les ordres de sa Majesté l'Empereur Napoléon le Grand.—Histoire Naturelle. Tome premier; Quatrième partie; pp. 77-98. 1827.—Seconde Edition, dédiée au Roi, publiée par C. L. F. Panckoucke. Tome XXII. Histoire Naturelle; Zoologie; Animaux Invertébrés (Suite).—pp. 249-290.
- BUDDE-LUND (G.).—1885. Crustacea Isopoda Terrestria, per Familias et Genera et Species descripta.—Hauniae. 320 pp.
- DANA (J. D.).—1852. On the Classification of the Crustacea Choristopoda or Tetradecapoda.—*Amer. J. Sci. Arts.* (2) 14: 297-316.
- DANA (J. D.).—1853. Crustacea in United States Exploring Expedition during the years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842 under the command of Charles Wilkes, U.S.N. Vol. 14. Part II. Philadelphia. 1618 pp.; 96 pl.
- DUPONCHEL.—1842. Notice sur la vie et les travaux de Jean-Victor Audouin.—*Ann. Soc. ent. France.* 2: 95-171.
- HOLTHUIS (L. B.).—1951. On the objection, from the carcinological point of view, of accepting the name "*Tylos*" Meigen 1800 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) and the consequent Rejection of the name "*Tylos*" (Latreille MS.) Audouin, 1826 (Class Crustacea, Order Isopoda).—*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6: 128.
- KOCH (L.).—1856. Crustacea, in ROSENHAUER (W. G.), Die Tiere Andalusiens nach dem Resultate einer Reise zusammengestellt, nebst den Beschreibungen von 249 neuen oder bis jetzt noch unbeschriebenen Gattungen und Arten. Erlangen. 429 pp.; Taf. I-III.
- LATREILLE (P. A.).—1829. Crustacés, Arachnides et partie des Insectes, in Le Règne animal, distribué d'après son organisation pour servir de base à l'histoire naturelle des animaux et d'introduction à l'anatomie comparée, par M. le Baron Cuvier.—Nouvelle Edition, revue et augmentée.—Tome IV. Paris. 605 pp.
- MILNE-EDWARDS (H.).—1840. Histoire Naturelle des Crustacés, comprenant l'anatomie, la physiologie et la classification de ces animaux. Tome III. Paris. 605 pp.
- SHERBORN (C. D.).—1897. On the Dates of the Natural History portion of Savigny's "Description de l'Égypte".—*Proc. zool. Soc. London.* 1897: 285-288.
- STEBBING (T. R. R.).—1910. Reports on the Marine Biology of the Sudanese Red Sea.—XIV. On the Crustacea Isopoda and Tanaidacea.—*J. linn. Soc. Lond. (Zool.)* 31: 215-230, pl. 21-23.
- VANDEL (A.).—1951. Objection to proposal submitted by Professor Martin L. Aczél in favour of the Addition of the name "*Tylos*" to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology".—*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2: 345.

ON THE AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF PUBLICATION OF
THE GENERIC NAME " TYLOS " (CLASS CRUSTACEA,
ORDER ISOPODA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)501)

The present note is concerned with the question of the date to be assigned to the generic name *Tylos* (Latreille MS.) introduced by Jean-Victor Audouin for a genus of Crustacea (Order Isopoda) in the text prepared by that author for the Crustacea Section of the work by M. J. C. L. de Savigny entitled *Description de l'Egypte*, the plates of which were prepared in the period "1805-1812." This question becomes relevant to the work of the Commission because of the application for the validation of this name submitted by Professor A. Vandel (*Toulouse*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 347 ; *id.*, 1952, *ibid.* 6 : 174-176) in opposition to the proposal previously submitted by Professor Martin L. Aczél (*Tucumán*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 156-157) that the earlier name *Tylos* Meigen, 1800 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

2. The authorship of the crustacean name *Tylos* has been attributed by some authors to Audouin and by others to P. A. Latreille ; the date of publication has been treated by some authors as "1825" and by others as "1826." The position as regards these matters is discussed in the following paragraphs.

3. *Authorship of the name "Tylos" as applied to a genus of Crustacea* : As fully explained by Professor Vandel in the second of the two papers referred to above, the duty of preparing the text of the Crustacea Section of Savigny's *Description de l'Egypte* was undertaken by Audouin at the request of the French Government signified in a letter dated "19 mars 1825." In the absence of evidence to the contrary it must therefore certainly be concluded that for the purposes of zoological nomenclature Audouin is the author of all names published for the first time in the foregoing Section of Savigny's work. The only circumstances in which any other author could be accepted as the author of a new name in the Section prepared by Audouin would be if it could be shown that, in the case of some particular name, Audouin had done no more than publish a new name proposed by some other author, that other author's manuscript description for the genus or species concerned being at the same time published by Audouin, that description therefore forming the "indication" required by Article 25 of the *Règles*.

4. Those authors who have treated Latreille and not Audouin as the author of the name *Tylos* have based that view upon the passage in which the name *Tylos* was first introduced, which has been quoted by Professor Vandel in the more recent of the papers referred to above. It is clear from this passage that Audouin recognised that the (at that time unpublished) name *Tylos* had been proposed in manuscript by Latreille, but, in publishing that name, Audouin did not quote from Latreille's manuscripts and the words characterising the genus *Tylos* then published by Audouin were written by that author and not by Latreille. The position is therefore that, as published in the Crustacea Section of Savigny's *Description*, the name *Tylos*, though a manuscript name of Latreille's, was provided with its "indication" by Audouin and not Latreille and must therefore for the purposes of zoological nomenclature be attributed to Audouin and not to Latreille. If it were desired to indicate the full history of this name, the citation "*Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin" could, as Professor Vandel has remarked, be conveniently employed.

5. *Date of publication of the name "Tylos" as applied to a genus of Crustacea* : The Crustacea Section of the text of Savigny's *Description de l'Egypte* is undated and it is necessary therefore to rely upon indirect methods for determining the date to be accepted for names published in it. Those authors who have accepted the date "1825" have relied upon the fact that, as pointed out by Professor Vandel (see paragraph 3 above), the task of preparing this text was committed to Audouin by the Minister of the Interior in a letter dated 19th March, 1825, and they have assumed that between that date and 31st December, 1825, the text was prepared by Audouin and actually published by the authorities. Sherborn (1897, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1897 : 287) examined this question and came to the conclusion that the date "1826" was to be preferred

to the date "1825"; this view was restated by that author in 1931 (*Index Anim.*, Pars secund. : 6700) and had also in the meanwhile been adopted in 1913 by the compiler of the *Catalogue of Books... in the British Museum (Natural History)* (4:1816). Sherborn's ground for taking this view was based on an examination of all the evidence which he had been able to collect, including (1) a statement by Engelmann (*Bibl. Hist. nat.* : 340) that the Crustacea Section and six other Sections of Part 4 of volume 1 of the *Description* were published in 1826 (2) the letter dated "19 mars 1825" committing the Crustacea Section to Audouin (to which I have referred above) and a paper by Duponchel (1842) where it is stated that it was in 1826 that Audouin was invited to undertake this task (3) a statement by Dr. John Anderson that he had "ascertained that Savigny's sight failed him, and that no manuscripts of any kind were handed over to Audouin, so that Audouin had to begin *de novo*."

6. The evidence discussed above is of interest from a bibliographical point of view but up to 1948 it had no definite bearing on the question of the dates to be assigned to new names in the Crustacea Section of the *Description*, for prior to that year there existed no provisions in the *Règles* for determining the date to be assigned to a zoological name where the date of publication of that name was not known. In 1948 however the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology decided to insert in the *Règles* provisions for regulating this matter (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 223-225). Under that decision a name is to be deemed to have been published on the date specified in the work concerned, as the date of publication (if any such date is so specified) unless and until evidence is forthcoming to show that that date is incorrect and, where no date of publication is given in the work concerned, a name published in that book is to be treated as having been published on a date determined in accordance with a series of rules there laid down, the general effect of which is that such a name is to take priority only as from a date by which evidence may be found that publication had actually taken place.

7. Turning back to the Crustacea Section of Savigny's *Description*, we find that the only date mentioned in it is the date "19 mars 1825," as the date on which the Minister of the Interior asked Audouin to undertake the preparation of the text. So far as the original publication is concerned, the only evidence provided is that at earliest Audouin cannot have begun to write the text until after having received the Minister's invitation of 19th March, 1825. Publication cannot therefore have taken place until such time as, after 19th March, 1825, (1) Audouin wrote the text and (2) that text was printed and published, a twofold process which must have occupied a considerable time and is most unlikely to have been completed in so short a period as nine and a half months (mid-March to end-December), more especially in view of the evidence of Dr. Anderson that Audouin received no manuscripts from Savigny and had therefore to write the entire text himself. In such circumstances publication could hardly have taken place within twelve months at the earliest of the time when Audouin was invited to prepare the text. In other words, the year 1826 must be regarded as the earliest year in which this Section can have been published. There is no direct evidence that this Section was in fact published as early as 1826 and the possibility that publication did not take place until 1827 or even later cannot be excluded. We have however the statement by Englemann that publication took place in 1826 and the similar conclusion reached by Sherborn. On balance, it would seem reasonable to conclude (1) that the name *Tylos* Audouin was published before the end of 1826 but (2) that it is extremely improbable that it was published before the opening of that year. On this basis we should adopt the year "1826" as that in which this name was published. That date, being derived solely from indirect sources, should, when cited, be enclosed within square brackets, as prescribed in such cases by the International Congress of Zoology (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 226, Point (c)).

8. *Conclusions*: The conclusions derived from the foregoing review may be summarised as follows:—

- (1) The name *Tylos*, as a name for a genus of Crustacea, was originally proposed in manuscript by Latreille; it was first published by Audouin; the "indication" by which it was accompanied when it was so published was provided by Audouin and not by means of a quotation from a manuscript of Latreille's. The name *Tylos* is therefore attributable for nomenclatorial purposes to Audouin and not to Latreille, though it would be permissible, if it were so desired, to cite this name as "*Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin."
- (2) The work in which the name *Tylos* Audouin was published is undated, and the date to be attributed to that name can therefore be ascertained only by indirect evidence. On balance it appears that the most probable date for the publication of this name is 1826.
- (3) In the light of (1) and (2) above, this name should be cited as "*Tylos* Audouin, [1826]" or if so preferred, as "*Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin [1826]."

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE
NAMES "TITANIA," "DORILAS," "TENDIPES," "PHILIA,"
AND "TYLOS," ALL OF MEIGEN, 1800 (CLASS INSECTA,
ORDER DIPTERA)**

By F. R. SHAW

(University of Massachusetts, Department of Entomology, Amherst, Mass., U.S.A.)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)197, 221, 469, 498, 501)

(Letter dated 10th October 1951)

I note in a recent issue of the *Entomologist* a statement asking specialists in Diptera to express their views on the following:—

Titania Meigen, 1800, vs. *Chlorops* Meigen, 1803

Dorilas Meigen, 1800, vs. *Pipunculus* Latreille [1802–03]

Tendipes Meigen, 1800, vs. *Chironomus* Meigen, 1803

Philia Meigen, 1800, vs. *Dilophus* Meigen, 1803

Tylos Meigen, 1800 vs. *Micropeza* Meigen, 1803.

With no exceptions I would vote against the use of the Meigen 1800 names. The names in themselves are meaningless and the fact that a later worker set up some type species, concerning which in many cases he knew nothing, would not seem to me to warrant the retention of the 1800 names.

**SUPPORT FOR DR. W. E. CHINA'S PROPOSAL RELATING
TO THE GENERIC NAME "CAPSUS" FABRICIUS, 1803
(CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)**

By J. C. M. CARVALHO

(Museum Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)211)

(Letter dated 18th September 1951)

As I mentioned to you at Amsterdam, this letter is being written to support Dr. China's proposal for the International Commission to use its plenary powers to vary the type species of the genus *Capsus* Fabricius, 1803 (China, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 103–104).

The proposal is very desirable and will help considerably the specialists working in the Hemiptera.

**ZU DEM VORSCHLAG VON DR. F. ELIZABETH ALEX-
ANDER ZUR ERHALTUNG DER NAMEN "CONCHIDIUM"
UND "PENTAMERUS" IN DER GEGENWÄRTIG GEB-
RÄUCHLICHEN ANWENDUNG**

By HERTA SCHMIDT

(Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)286)

(Letter dated 4th June 1951)

Die von Dr. Elizabeth Alexander vorgeschlagene Lösung zur Beseitigung der bestehenden Unklarheiten erscheint mir zweckmässig.

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL FOR THE RETENTION
OF THE NAME "LIGIA" FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS CRUS-
TACEA, ORDER DECAPODA) SUBMITTED BY THE LATE
MISS A. M. BUITENDIJK AND DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS**

By HANS STROUHAL

(Naturhistorisches Museum, Zoologische Abteilung, Vienna, Austria)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)209)

(Letter dated 9th October 1951)

In agreement with the late A. M. Buitendijk and L. B. Holthuis (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2: 99-101) I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

- (1) to use its plenary powers:—
 - (a) to suppress the undermentioned generic names both for the purposes of the Law of Priority and for those of the Law of Homonymy:—
 - (i) *Ligia* Weber, 1795;
 - (ii) *Carcinus* Latreille, 1796;
 - (b) to validate the undermentioned generic names:—
 - (i) *Ligia* Fabricius, 1798;
 - (ii) *Carcinus* Leach, 1814;
- (2) to place the undermentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with the type species severally specified below:—
 - (a) *Ligia* Fabricius, 1798 (type species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: *Oniscus oceanicus* Linnaeus, 1767) (gender of generic name: feminine);
 - (b) *Carcinus* Leach, 1814 (type species, by monotypy: *Cancer maenas* Linnaeus, 1758) (gender of generic name: masculine);
- (3) to place the undermentioned generic names, proposed in (1)(a) above to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*:—
 - (a) *Ligia* Weber, 1795 (suppressed under (1)(a)(i) above);
 - (b) *Carcinus* Latreille, 1796 (suppressed under (1)(a)(ii) above);
 - (c) *Carcinides* Rathbun, 1897 (an objective synonym of *Carcinus* Leach, 1814);
- (4) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*:—
 - (a) *maenas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer maenas*);
 - (b) *oceanicus* Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Oniscus oceanicus*).

**OBJECTION TO DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS' PROPOSALS
RELATING TO THE NAMES "CRANGON" FABRICIUS,
1798, AND "ALPHEUS" FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS
CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)**

By HERBERT M. HALE

(*The South Australian Museum, Adelaide, South Australia*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

(Letter dated 1st November 1950)

I am interested to learn that Dr. L. B. Holthuis of the Rijksmuseum in Leiden has applied to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a suspension of the rules to allow for the reinstatement of *Alpheus* of Fabricius for *Crangon* of Weber and of *Crangon* of Fabricius for *Crago* of Lamarck.

Together with a number of other working carcinologists I have accepted, in my taxonomic papers, Weber's names for the genera concerned. One can understand the desire of some workers, particularly those in Europe to retain *Alpheus* and *Crangon* of Fabricius particularly as the genera contain well-known forms repeatedly referred to in text books etc., for many years. However, I do feel that as *Crangon* of Weber and *Crago* of Lamarck have been recognised and used for such a long time, particularly by most of the active workers in the United States, the restoring of the old names now is not advisable.

**SUPPORT FOR DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS' PROPOSALS
RELATING TO THE NAMES "CRANGON" FABRICIUS,
1798, AND "ALPHEUS" FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS
CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)**

By R. Ph. DOLLFUS

(*Laboratoire d'Helminthologie Coloniale et de Parasitologie Comparée, Muséum
National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

(Note dated 25th June 1951)

Je suis pour la validation de *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798, et d'*Alpheus* Fabricius, 1798, d'accord avec L. B. Holthuis.

COMMENTS ON THE APPLICATIONS RELATING TO THE
NAMES "CRANGON" FABRICIUS, 1798, AND "LIGIA"
FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECA-
PODA) SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS, AND TO
THE APPLICATION RELATING TO THE NAME "TYLOS"
MEIGEN, 1800 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA) SUB-
MITTED BY PROFESSOR MARTIN L. ACZÉL

By CHARLES H. BLAKE

(Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Biology, Cambridge,
Mass., U.S.A.)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)231, 209, 501)

(Letter dated 8th August 1951)

I should like to make comments on three nomenclatorial cases which are pending. They bear the file numbers (Z.N.(S.) 231, 209 and 501). The first two cases bear on the acceptability of the infamous Weber publication.

In 1904 the International Commission regarded Weber's work as legally published in spite of the fact that for more than a century it had not been regarded by most authors as legitimately, that is ethically, published. There seems to be no doubt that Weber was, in fact, a sort of zoological pirate. The question as to whether Fabricius deliberately crossed Weber up in 1798 when he himself published his own names is not important. The difficulty seems to arise from the fact that the Commission in 1904 took a strictly legalistic view of the matter, and from that point of view their decision is correct; but they failed to take into account two things: (1) that the non-use of Weber's names had in fact established an unwritten precedent, and (2) that, based on the maxim *stare decisis*, the Commission would have been better advised to have followed that use rather than to overthrow it on technical grounds. Zoological nomenclature as a whole has suffered in part from the fact that unwritten and traditional decisions have been either accepted or ignored in a rather uncertain fashion.

In a previous letter I mentioned the maxim *stare decisis* I believe, and I take the liberty here of quoting from Baldwin's 1928 edition of Bouvier's *Law Dictionary*, pages 1127-1128 as to the view taken of the maxim in the United States and I would assume that the English view of it would be essentially similar. The maxim may be defined as follows; "When a point has been settled by decision, it forms a precedent which is not afterwards to be departed from." "A court . . . should consider how far its action would affect transactions entered into and acted upon, under the law as it exists; 11 Tex. 455; "but where a decision relates to the validity of certain modes of transacting business, and a change of decision must necessarily invalidate everything above in the mode prescribed by the former case . . . the maxim becomes imperative . . . 15 Wisc. 691".

It must be admitted at this point that the maxim may strike continental European jurists with considerably less force than it has for the Anglo-Saxon jurist. This does not make it any less sound. Turning now to File Z.N.(S.)231, I would associate myself with Fenner Chace's opinion as to the use of the generic names *Crago* and *Crangon*. Here I mention a point with regard to the objection raised as to the similarity of family names derived from these two generic names. There is a much worse and unavoidable case which nonetheless has caused no confusion. In the beetles we have an occasionally used family name LARIDAE from the genus *Lara*. In birds we have the same family name based on the genus *Larus* and in wasps the family name LARRIDAE based on the generic name *Larra*. Granted these all occur in different orders rather than within the same order. However nearly

identical sub-family names occur in the crustacean family CYTHEREIDAE without causing confusion. Therefore, I hold that the similarity of family names is no bar to the employment of *Crago* and *Crangon*.

With reference to File Z.N.(S.)209, on the basis of usage I think we should certainly accept *Ligia* of Fabricius, 1798, in spite of the fact that the Weber application of *Ligia* is older. Here we might argue that *Ligia* is a genus not much treated by American authors who tend to accent Weber and hence the weight of opinion rests on the Europeans. However, this would mean contravening the decision of the International Commission, while upholding it in the previous case. If this be done, then we have in effect nullification and while nullification is a time-honoured American method of popular legislation, I think it would be unsafe to introduce it into the legislation with regard to zoological nomenclature. Hence, as regards these two cases, I would like to see the opinion of 1904 stand in spite of the fact that it may appear to cause some confusion. Here, I think, no further confusion will be caused than already exists.

Turning now to File Z.N.(S.)501, the apparent situation is somewhat similar. It would appear that Meigen himself wished to suppress his names of 1800 in favour of those of 1803. And the Commission might, in *Opinion* 28, have been better advised to follow Meigen rather than the letter of the law. However, the instant case *Tylos* versus *Micropeza* is not as simple as some of the other cases may be. There is a genus *Tylos* in the Isopod Crustacea proposed by V. Audouin in 1825. This genus, which is the type genus of the family and the sole genus of the family, has enjoyed uninterrupted use since that time. There exists only one possible synonym due to L. Koch in 1856. In spite of the testimony of von Ebner in 1868, the title of Koch's name to be considered a synonym of *Tylos* is clouded. It has never been employed as an accepted generic name since 1856. We may set then this uninterrupted use of the generic name *Tylos* against the fact that on Aczél's own showing the name was used in the Diptera only occasionally so recently as 1932 and certainly *Micropeza* is fully as well known. Parenthetically, the family name TYLIDAE in the Crustacea dates back at least to 1885 while in the Diptera it dates only from 1931. Therefore, in this case it would seem as though there would be less ultimate confusion if *Tylos* of Meigen were declared ineligible, not on the basis of a reversal of *Opinion* 28, but rather on the basis that it comes into conflict with a name in another group which has enjoyed a century and a quarter of uninterrupted use; use which dates back to the days when Meigen's own wishes with regard to the names of 1800 were followed.

SUPPORT FOR APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS IN REGARD TO THE NAMES OF FIVE GENERA OF THE CLASS CRUSTACEA

By I. GORDON, D.Sc., Ph.D.

(British Museum (Natural History), London)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)231, 209, 473, 474, 475)

(Letter dated 29th October 1951)

I wish to say that I am willing to add my support to all the proposals submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. L. B. Holthuis :

Commissión's Reference Z.N.(S.)231 (*Crangon*)

„ „ Z.N.(S.)209 (*Ligia*)

„ „ Z.N.(S.)473 (*Scyllarides*)

„ „ Z.N.(S.)474 (*Lysiosquilla*)

„ „ Z.N.(S.)475 (*Odontodactylus*)

**OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL THAT THE PLENARY
POWERS SHOULD BE USED TO VALIDATE THE NAMES
"CRANGON" FABRICIUS, 1798, AND "ALPHEUS" FABRI-
CIUS, 1798 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)**

By BELLE A. STEVENS

(Department of Zoology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

(Letter dated 13th August 1951)

Having read Dr. L. B. Holthuis' proposals relating to the generic names *Crangon* Weber, 1795, and *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798 (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 69-72), I wish to present the following :

In connection with my work on the Caridea of the coast of Washington, I have had occasion over a period of several years to investigate rather thoroughly the *Crangon-Crago* matter. I greatly appreciate the clear statement of the case by Dr. Holthuis and deeply regret that something of this sort was not brought forth and an appeal for suspension of the rules presented years ago by someone among the older carcinologists who disregarded *Opinion* 17 of the Commission.

At this point nothing can be done to completely obliterate the existing confusion. I quite agree with Dr. Fenner A. Chace and Dr. Albert H. Banner that the change proposed by Dr. Holthuis is not now desirable. Such a change would needlessly magnify unfortunate systematic procedure of the past and due to the large volume and range of the literature involved, be very cumbersome to put into effect. Experienced workers in systematic zoology are capable of comprehending a brief statement of the facts concerned and other workers readily accept their findings. It seems to me expedient that the proposals of Dr. Holthuis be rejected.

**ANTRAG : "ALLE NAMEN, DIE AUF DIE OFFIZIELLE
LISTE GESETZT WORDEN SIND, SOLLEN ALS ENDGÜLTIG
GESCHÜTZT GELTEN, UNTER SUSPENSION DER
REGELN"**

By RUDOLF RICHTER

(Geologisch-Palaeontologisches Institut der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität,
Frankfurt a. Main, Germany)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)359)

(Application dated 18th October 1951)

Begründung :

Als die Internationale Kommission 1922 durch *Opinion* 73 die Offizielle Liste begonnen hat, hat sie ihre damalige Absicht in folgendem Satz ausgedrückt : "The chief object is to give to the general zoologists a list of names which, so far as can humanly be determined, seem to be beyond dispute." Jeder Name, den die Kommission damals und in den nächsten Jahren auf die Liste gesetzt hat, soll nur "kraft seines eigenen Rechts" einen Platz auf der Liste haben. Die Aufnahme in die Liste sollte den betreffenden Namen nicht schützen, sondern nur die Wahrscheinlichkeit aussprechen, dass er voraussichtlich keines Schutzes bedürfe. Diese Namen sind nicht gegen ein älteres Homonym geschützt, sobald ein solches zum Vorschein kommt.

Infolge dieser Verzichts auf Schutz der Namen hat die Liste die Zoologen nicht befriedigt. Die Kommission hat daher allmählich ihre Politik geändert, indem sie *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 6 (May 1952)

später Gattungs-Namen, samt dem Genotypus, unter Suspension der Regeln auf die Liste gesetzt hat. Diese Namen sind also gegen ältere Homonyms endgültig geschützt. Sie können aus nomenklatorischen Gründen nicht mehr geändert werden. Ebenso hat die Kommission auch gewisse Namen, welche Verwirrung hervorrufen könnten, unter Suspension der Regeln endgültig unterdrückt.

Leider sind bisher nur etwa 50 Namen der Offiziellen Liste (unter mehreren Hundert Namen) unter Suspension geschützt worden. Es ist ein Verdienst von Secretary F. Hemming, dass er diese Politik energischer angewendet hat. Es ist aber der allgemeine Wunsch der internationalen "Paläontologischen Gesellschaft", der "Deutschen Geologischen Gesellschaft" und vermutlich auch aller zoologischen Gesellschaften der Welt, dass die Zahl der endgültig geschützten Namen vergrößert werden möchte.

Es ist auch nicht förderlich für die Autorität der Nomenklatur, dass die Offizielle Liste zwei Kategorien von Namen mit verschiedenem Status enthält. Viele Zoologen sind sich über die Verschiedenheit der beiden Kategorien nicht klar. Es hat auch keine "Liste" im wahren Sinne gegeben, d.h. keine Zusammenstellung der in vielen Opinions zerstreuten Namen, bis 1948*.

Ich werde später den Antrag stellen: "Alle generischen und subgenerischen Namen, die im "Treatise of Invertebrate Paleontology" (Editor R. S. Moore) enthalten sind, werden, samt ihren Genotypen, auf die Offizielle Liste unter Suspension gesetzt." Damit würde die Kommission praktisch alle Namen, die in der Paläontologie für Gattungen und Untergattungen gebraucht werden, endgültig schützen. Da an dem "Treatise" fast alle Spezialisten der Welt gemeinsam arbeiten, würde die Garantie für die verantwortliche Auswahl der Namen gegeben sein. Ähnliches wäre auch für Teile der Zoologie denkbar. Damit würde die Kommission das grosse Werk, mit dem sie von den Kongressen beauftragt worden ist, mit einem Schlage dem Ziele nahegebracht haben.

Indem ich auf die Begründung hinweise, die ich 1948 S.158, 211, 212 gegeben habe, stelle ich hier den Antrag:

"Alle Namen, die auf die Offizielle Liste gesetzt worden sind, sollen als endgültig geschützt gelten, unter Suspension der Regeln"

* Die bisher einzige Zusammenstellung der Offiziellen Liste findet sich in RUD. RICHTER: "Einführung in die Zoologische Nomenklatur durch Erläuterung der Internationalen Regeln", 2. Auflage, S. 212-233. Die Namen der Kategorie, welche durch Suspension endgültig geschützt ist, ist hierbei durch fette Lettern kenntlich gemacht.

OBJECTION TO M. GILBERT RANSON'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By P. C. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY, B.Sc.

(University of Sheffield, Department of Geology, Sheffield, England)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Extract from a letter dated 2nd October 1951)

May I respond to the invitation set out in your note Z.N.(S.)365 concerning *Gryphaea* (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 239-240).

The name *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, is widely used, not only by specialists, but by general geologists. It includes species which are amongst the most common and best preserved fossils in existence. It has been the subject of well-known evolutionary studies. There are few names in palaeontology which stand in more need of protection than *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, and I would strongly oppose any suggestion to suppress it under the plenary powers.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELE- CYPODA)

By H. B. STENZEL

(University of Texas, Department of Geology, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.)

and

GORDON GUNTER

(Institute of Marine Science, Port Aransas, Texas, U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Enclosure to letter of 9th October 1951)

The proposed suppression of *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda) and the proposed validation of *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1819, would have the effect of removing the *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck from the genus *Gryphaea* and of fixing the generic name *Gryphaea* onto "*Gryphaea*" *angulata* Lamarck. The following arguments are presented in opposition to this shift:—

- (1) The words griffin and *Gryphaea* are derived from the classical Greek γρυπός (hooked) and are designed to denote a hooked, beaklike shape. Such a shape is characteristic of *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck and its congeners but is not characteristic of "*Gryphaea*" *angulata* Lamarck or its congeners. *Gryphaea* is a well-coined and well-chosen descriptive word for the former but not for the latter.
- (2) An examination of older and newer zoological literature, including paleontological and neontological literature, shows that *Gryphaea* has been used more often for *G. arcuata* Lamarck and its congeners than for *G. angulata* Lamarck and its congeners. Past and current usage, whether one would estimate it by number of pages or articles or authors, in paleontology and in neontology is in favor of retaining *Gryphaea* in combination with *arcuata* Lamarck.
- (3) Both words, *Gryphaea* and *arcuata*, have the same meaning (hooked), the one as a word derived from the Greek, the other as a Latin word. The Rules recommend selection of the type species of a genus by virtual tautonymy.
- (4) *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, was validly proposed through definition and original list of species. The original list contains nine items, of which six, among them *G. arcuata* Lamarck, are defined by references to figures in previously published works and are regarded by us as validly proposed specific names. The remaining three items, among them *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck, are neither described nor figured nor validated by references; hence they are regarded by us as *nomina nuda*. *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, was validly selected as the type species of the genus by Anton, 1838. *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck, 1801, being a *nomen nudum* as of that date, cannot be considered as a possible candidate for selection as type species of *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, and such subsequent designations to that effect as may have been made can not be regarded as valid. In summary, the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, and its type species *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, are valid and stand on firm legal grounds (compare Dall, 1898; Hertlein, 1933; and Stenzel, 1947).

Therefore we recommend that *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, and *G. arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, as the type species be placed on the *Official Lists*.

References

- Dall, W. H. (1898), Contributions to the Tertiary fauna of Florida, etc.: *Trans. Wagner Free Inst. Sci. Philad.* **3** (4): 672-675.
- Hertlein, L. G. (1933). A new gryphaeoid oyster from the Eocene of California; *Trans. San Diego Soc. nat. Hist.* **7** (no. 22): 277-278.
- Stenzel, H. B. (1947). Nomenclatural synopsis of supraspecific groups of the family Ostreidae (Pelecypoda, Mollusca): *J. Paleont.* **21** (no. 2): 174-175.
- Gunter, G. (1950). The generic status of living oysters and the scientific name of the common American species: *Amer. Midl. Nat.* **43** (no. 2): 438-449.

Supplementary Note on the "Gryphaea" problem

By G. GUNTER

(University of Texas, Institute of Marine Science, Port Aransas, Texas, U.S.A.)

(Letter dated 11th October 1951)

As an addendum to the enclosed statement which I have signed I should like to point out that *Gryphaea* has long been used by practically all paleontologists for a fossil genus of oyster which became extinct several million years ago. *Gryphaea arcuata* was the type species of the genus as set up by Anton (1839). The supposed validation of *Gryphaea angulata* as the type species of the living genus by Children cannot be valid because it was a *nomen nudum* of Lamarck, 1801. If Doctor Ranson's argument is that *G. arcuata* was confused and could not have been properly designated by Anton, it does nothing to validate *angulata*, an indubitable *nomen nudum*, and if *arcuata* is thrown out as the type species, it leaves the whole situation in utter and complete confusion.

Concerning the matter of usage, it is only in recent years that ostreologists have come to separate the two common living genera of oysters. Taxonomists in this country and Japan who have been concerned with the question have all recognised that *Gryphaea* is not the proper name and have all stated that *Crassostrea* is the proper generic or subgeneric designation.

SUPPORT FOR M. GILBERT RANSON'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1819 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By G. LECOINTRE

(Rabat, Maroc)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Letter dated 17th October 1951)

Je tiens à vous dire que je suis entièrement d'accord avec M. Gilbert Ranson du Muséum de Paris sur le point suivant :

Le genre *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1819, a comme génotype : *Ostrea angulata*.

Je suis tout à fait d'accord également pour que le "Système" de Lamarck de 1801 ne soit plus utilisé pour la sélection du genre.

**SUPPORT FOR M. GILBERT RANSON'S PROPOSAL IN
REGARD TO THE NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1819
(CLASS PELECYPODA)**

By S. JAECKEL

(Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität, Berlin, Germany)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Letter dated 29th October 1951)

In Uebereinstimmung mit Herr. G. Ranson und auf Grund seiner Arbeit "*Gryphaea*" *angulata* Lmk. est l'espèce "Type" du Genre *Gryphaea* Lmk. (*Bulletin du Museum* Paris 2. ser. t. XX 1948) halte ich *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck für den Typus der Gattung *Gryphaea*.

**SUPPORT FOR M. RANSON'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO
THE NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1819 (CLASS
PELECYPODA)**

By JEAN ROGER

(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Note received on 31st July 1951)

Au sujet du genre *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1819, je suis entièrement d'accord avec l'interprétation proposé par M. Ranson dans sa note au *Bull. Mus. nat. Hist. nat.* (1948), (2), 20, no. 6, p. 514-516.

**OBJECTION TO M. GILBERT RANSON'S APPLICATION IN
REGARD TO THE GENERIC NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAM-
ARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELECYPODA)**

Communication signed by four members of the staff of the United States National Museum and by six members of the staff of the United States Geological Survey

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Covering letter dated 30th October, 1951, from Dr. Harald A. Rehder, Curator, Division of Mollusks, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

I am sending you herewith the views of a group of systematic workers on mollusks here regarding the application of M. Ranson (Z.N.(S.)365). You will note that the signatories include four members of the staff of the U.S. National Museum and six members of the Geological Survey.

Enclosure

On the application to suppress the name *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, and thus validate *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1819

It is the viewpoint of the undersigned that *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, having been validly proposed, should stand, and that the type species is *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, validly selected by Anton in 1839.

The facts in the case are simple and quite clear under the rules. *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck was a *nomen nudum* in 1801, and is therefore unavailable as the type species. This renders invalid Children's selection in 1823 of this species as type species.

This leaves as the only point to be debated the question whether strict adherence to the rules will cause confusion and inconvenience. Here we, the undersigned, are all agreed that the rules should be followed. Any other course would, in our estimation, lead to confusion.

All workers on this side of the Atlantic have used *Gryphaea* for the Mesozoic oysters since Dall's treatment of the subject in 1898. Even before that Meek, in 1876, used the name in this sense. As a matter of fact, most of the European workers have used the name *Gryphaea* for the Mesozoic forms, albeit extending its geological range into the recent by using *angulata* Lamarck as the type or example and only living species, and placing *Liogryphaea* Fischer, 1885 (= *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, not 1819) as a subgenus or section under *Gryphaea*. Stoliczka, 1871, Fischer, 1885, and Zittel, 1895, used the names in this way.

To set aside the rules and follow M. Ranson's suggestion would mean that the common Western Atlantic oyster would be known as *Gryphaea virginica* (Gmelin), a combination that no one has used except Ranson, and the Mesozoic-Tertiary oysters, that have always, both in this country and abroad, been called *Gryphaea*, would go under the generic name *Liogryphaea*.

We are fully in agreement with Dr. L. R. Cox's presentation of the case against this application, and his recommendations (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 (II) : 324-331).

Harald A. Rehder,
Curator, Division of Mollusks

Joseph P. S. Morrison,
Assoc. Curator,
Division of Mollusks

Julia Gardner
W. P. Woodring
John B. Reeside, Jr.
Ralph W. Imlay
L. W. Stephenson
W. A. Cobban

} Paleontologists of the
U.S. Geological Survey

R. Tucker Abbott,
Assoc. Curator—Smithsonian

David Nicol,
Assoc. Curator, J.P. & P.,
U.S.N.M.

ON THE QUESTION OF THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERIC NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By P. KORRINGA

(Ruksinstituut voor Visscheruonderzoek, Bergen op Zoom, The Netherlands)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Enclosure to letter dated 27th October 1951)

In his 1948 note Ranson discusses the problem whether or not *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck may be considered as the type species of the genus *Gryphaea*. He points

out that Lamarck's first description of the genus *Gryphaea*, dating from 1801, is but a preliminary one, and that therefore the genus *Gryphaea* should be considered to date from 1819, when Lamarck redescribed it in his *Histoire Naturelle des Animaux sans Vertèbres*. This view accepted, *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck would be the type species of the genus, selected by Children in 1823. Therefore Ranson presented to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its session held in Paris in 1948 a communication in which he sought to prove that the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck is *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck.

As can be deduced from Hemming's report (1951) in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, a strict application of the international rules of zoological nomenclature leads, however, to the conclusion that the fossil species *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck is the type species of the genus *Gryphaea*. Moreover, Children's selection of *Gryphaea angulata* as type species is invalid since at the time when in 1801 the generic name *Gryphaea* was first validly published by Lamarck, the name *Gryphaea angulata*, then cited by Lamarck, was a mere *nomen nudum* and accordingly does not rank as an originally included species, and is ineligible for selection by a later author to be the type species of the genus in question.

Therefore Gunter (1950) is certainly right in stating that a strict application of the international rules of nomenclature leads to using the generic name *Gryphaea* for some Fossil species only (type species *G. arcuata*), and to the conclusion that the generic name *Crassostrea* (Sacco, 1897) is the first valid name for oysters of the type *angulata*, *virginica*, *gigas*, etc. Gunter rightly states that these oysters differ in too many respects from the flat oysters to lump them with the latter under the generic name *Ostrea*.

However right Gunter may be, I feel very reluctant to use the generic name *Crassostrea* and to suppress the genus *Gryphaea* for the Recent species. This certainly would enhance the confusion. For, up till now, very few have ever used the name *Crassostrea* for the Portuguese oyster and its nearest allies, while the term *Gryphaea* has been used very widely in this sense, even among practical oystermen. It is the feeling of others also that a too strict application of the "rules" often leads to absurdities. Fortunately there is a way to get around such difficulties: the plenary powers of the International Commission on Nomenclature could be used to suppress the name *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, and all uses of that generic name from 1801 to the date of 1819, when it was republished by Lamarck in the *Histoire Naturelle des Animaux sans Vertèbres*. Then the name *Gryphaea* Lamarck 1819, thus validated, has as its type species the Recent species *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck, 1819 (by selection by Children, 1823). This is stated in the note by Hemming of which the object was to attract the attention of interested specialists to the problem.

Awaiting the final decision of the International Commission on Nomenclature, I have to make a preliminary choice in writing a review. To minimise confusion I prefer to follow Ranson, and therefore use in that paper the very familiar name *Gryphaea* for all oysters of the type *angulata*, *virginica*, *gigas*, etc. In any case I agree completely with both Ranson and Gunter that these oysters should be placed in a separate genus.

In this difficult nomenclatural matter I have been kindly advised by Dr. C. O. van Regteren Altena of the Leyden Museum of Natural History. Maybe a greater number of interested specialists, until now not familiar with Hemming's report, will furnish the Commission on International Nomenclature upon its request with their view on this important and intricate problem, so that the final conclusion may eventually clear up the confusion.

References :

- Gunter (1950)—*American Midland Naturalist* 43 (2) : 438-449
 Hemming (1951)—*Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 2 (6/8) : 239-240
 Ranson (1948)—*Bulletin du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle*, Paris (2) 20 : 514-516

SUPPORT FOR M. GILBERT RANSON'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By A. CHAVAN
(Thoiry, Ain, France)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Extract from a letter dated 31st October 1951)

Referring, now, to your notice in the "Journal of Paleontology" (25 (4), July 1951, p. 537) on *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, I should willingly agree with its proposed suppression, validating *Gryphaea* of Lamarck, 1819. As pointed out by Dr. Ranson (1948, *Bull. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris* (2ème sér.) 20 (6) : 514-16), the list of species given by Lamarck in 1801 is evidently a provisional one, Lamarck himself indicating this in his book. As expressed by *Opinion* 79, Lamarck's "Système . . ." of 1801 is not acceptable as designation of type species. I should accept Children's designation (1823) of *G. angulata* and I wish to point out that, if such a suggestion is followed by the International Commission, *Gryphaea* will then become a much more useful name than if *G. arcuata* is selected, such a selection bringing drastic and perhaps useless changes in the generic allocation of a number of well-known species.

ON M. GILBERT RANSON'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By G. MERMOD
(Bureau de Malacologie, Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, Genève)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Letter dated 17th January 1952)

Au sujet du nom à adopter pour ce que Lamarck a appelé *Gryphaea angulata*, il me semble absolument certain que Lamarck en 1801 (*Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres*, page 398) a eu l'intention de créer le genre *Gryphaea* avec l'espèce *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck comme l'espèce type.

Si, en 1801, l'espèce n'a pas été définie dans ses caractères spécifiques, c'est que le plan de l'ouvrage était de publier un *Genera* ou il ne pouvait pas y avoir de place pour des diagnoses spécifiques. Lamarck signale son intention de publier un tableau général avec les diagnoses de toutes les espèces à lui connues (p. 399 *Nota*, loc. cit., 1801).

En tout cas, en 1819 (*Histoire des Animaux sans Vertèbres*, vol. 6, p. 197) on remarque que la caractéristique du genre *Gryphaea* est presque mot pour mot la même que celle de 1801 et c'est de nouveau la seule espèce vivante, *Gryphaea angulata*, qui est citée et caractérisée spécifiquement la première en liste.

Il me semble qu'il n'y a aucun avantage à remplacer *Gryphaea*, nom valable, utilisé depuis 1801 ou en tout cas 1819 par le nom *Crassostrea* Sacco, 1897.

Le Musée de Genève possède un exemplaire de *Gryphaea angulata*. Il n'est pas certain qu'il ait été en mains de Lamarck, car celui-ci cite un exemplaire de 100 mm. de long alors que le nôtre n'en mesure que 90. Mais en tout cas notre coquille est celle qui fut figurée par Delessert (1841, *Recueil de Coquilles de Lamarck*, pl. 20, fig. 3).

SUPPORT FOR M. GILBERT RANSON'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1819 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By H. A. COLE

(Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Fisheries Experiment Station, Conway, Wales)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Letter dated 6th February 1952)

I understand that the question of the retention of the generic name *Gryphaea* for the Portuguese oyster and its nearest living relatives is now under consideration. I should like to add my name to those asking for its retention.

I am not concerned with the systematic arguments, which no doubt will be presented in full by Dr. Gilbert Ranson and others, but with practical considerations. As you know, it is only comparatively recently that the propriety of dividing the oviparous oysters from the larviparous oysters has been generally accepted, following the work of T. C. Nelson and others. To the well-marked differences in anatomy and mode of reproduction, we (Cole and Knight-Jones, 1949, *Fish. Invest.* (2) 17 (No. 3) have added differences in the behaviour of the larvae at setting.

Throughout the period when oysters were, for the most part, grouped loosely together in the genus *Ostrea*, the identity of the Portuguese oyster was maintained by Continental workers under the name *Gryphaea angulata*. To adopt *Crassostrea* now would be to create fresh confusion. Already we have Australian and New Zealand workers referring their common commercial species to the genus *Saxostrea*, although they are clearly very closely related indeed to the Portuguese species. This confusion is, I believe, typical of what would follow if the name *Crassostrea* was adopted.

The division of oviparous from larviparous oysters has assisted materially in dispersing the confusion reigning regarding their physiological and environmental requirements. In consequence it has been appreciated that cultivation methods applicable to oysters of the genus *Gryphaea* may not be equally applicable to larviparous species. As a result many ill-designed attempts to apply American methods to the cultivation of flat oysters (genus *Ostrea*) in Europe, Japan, Australia and New Zealand, or North European methods to the cultivation of tropical oysters (genus *Gryphaea*) have been reconsidered.

In contrast, the methods developed by the French for the cultivation of *Gryphaea angulata* are being applied with very striking results in West and East Africa and in the Indian Ocean. To maintain the identity of the Portuguese oyster, and to establish the close relationship of the tropical oviparous oysters to it by grouping them under the same genus, cannot but assist in the development of oyster culture in these areas.

As I mentioned earlier, I am concerned with practical considerations as I feel that systematics should be the servant of applied biology. To conserve the name *Gryphaea* would undoubtedly be of great value to oyster biologists. I write as a worker for twenty years in this field.

Contents

(continued from front wrapper)

| (a) New Applications | Page |
|--|--------------------|
| (1) Proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes the names by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the pamphlet entitled "A Catalogue of the Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects, Plants, etc., contained in Edwards's Natural History." By the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History, New York | 163 |
| (2) Proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic names <i>Chortoicoetes</i> Brunner, 1893, and <i>Austroicetes</i> Uvarov, 1925 (Class Insecta, Order Orthoptera), and to direct that these names be treated as of the feminine gender. By K. H. L. Key (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia) | 163 |
| (3) Proposed use of the plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus <i>Mortonella</i> Pomel, 1883 (Class Scaphopoda), a genus based upon a misidentified type species, the species intended as such by the original author. By J. Wyatt Durham (University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.) | 168 |
| (4) Antrag: "Alle Namen, die auf die Offizielle Liste gesetzt worden sind, sollen als endgültig geschützt gelten, unter Suspension der Regeln." By Rudolf Richter (Geologisch-Palaeontologisches Institut der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany) | 184 |
| (b) Comments on applications already submitted | |
| (5) Dr. K. H. L. Key's application on the name <i>Chortoicoetes</i> Brunner, 1893: comments: by (1) H. G. Andrewartha (Adelaide, South Australia); (2) D. C. Swan (Adelaide, South Australia) | 166 |
| (6) The late Dr. Steven Corbet's proposal on the name <i>ajax</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (published in the combination <i>Papilio ajax</i>): comment by Austin H. Clark (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) | 167 |
| (7) Mr. J. Balfour-Browne's application on the name <i>Rantus</i> Dejean, 1833: comment by W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (Dumfries, Scotland) | 170 |
| (8) Mr. R. B. Benson's application on the name <i>Acantholyda</i> Costa, 1894: comment by R. Lambert & O. Peck (Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada) | 170 |
| (9) The Woodbury & Smith application on the trivial name of the Yellow Rattlesnake of the Colorado River Basin. Comment by R. Mertens (Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany) | 171 |
| (10) Professor H. E. Vokes's application on the name <i>Mytilus</i> Linnaeus, 1758: comments by: (1) R. Ph. Dollfus (Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris); (2) Gilbert Ranson (Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris) | 171 |
| (11) Applications submitted by various authors for the recognition of the following generic names by Meigen, 1800: <i>Titania</i> , <i>Dorilas</i> , <i>Tendipes</i> , <i>Philia</i> & <i>Tylos</i> : comments by: (1) Charles P. Alexander (University of Massachusetts, U.S.A.); (2) Edward L. Coher (University of Massachusetts, U.S.A.); (3) F. R. Shaw (University of Massachusetts, U.S.A.); (4) I. Gordon (British Museum (Natural History)) | 172, 179, 183 |
| (12) <i>Tylos</i> Audouin, [1826] (Class Crustacea, Order Isopoda) versus <i>Tylos</i> Meigen, 1800 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera): (1) A. Vandel (University of Toulouse, France); (2) T. Herold (Humboldt-Universität, Berlin); (3) I. Gordon (British Museum (Natural History)); (4) Charles H. Blake (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.); (5) Francis Hemming (Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) | 173, 174, 177, 182 |

Contents

(continued from overleaf)

| | Page |
|--|---------------|
| (13) Dr. W. E. China's application on the name <i>Capsus</i> Fabricius, 1803 : comment by J. C. M. Carvalho (<i>Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro</i>) | 179 |
| (14) Dr. Elizabeth Alexander's application on the name <i>Conchidium</i> as currently used for a genus of Brachiopoda ; comment by Herta Schmidt (<i>Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany</i>) | 179 |
| (15) Dr. L. B. Holthuis' application on the name <i>Ligia</i> Fabricius, 1798 : comments by : (1) Hans Strouhal (<i>Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna</i>) ; (2) Charles H. Blake (<i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.</i>) ; (3) I. Gordon (<i>British Museum (Natural History)</i>) | 180, 182, 183 |
| (16) The late Miss A. M. Buitendijk's and Dr. L. B. Holthuis' application on the name <i>Crangon</i> Fabricius, 1798 : comments by : (1) Herbert M. Hale (<i>South Australian Museum, Adelaide</i>) ; (2) R. Ph. Dollfus (<i>Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris</i>) ; (3) Charles H. Blake (<i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.</i>) ; Belle A. Stevens (<i>University of Washington, Seattle</i>) | 181, 182, 183 |
| (17) Dr. L. H. Holthuis' application on the name <i>Scyllarides</i> Gill, 1898 : comment by I. Gordon (<i>British Museum (Natural History)</i>) | 183 |
| (18) Dr. L. B. Holthuis' application on the name <i>Lysiosquilla</i> Dana, 1852 : comment by I. Gordon (<i>British Museum (Natural History)</i>) | 183 |
| (19) Dr. L. B. Holthuis' application on the name <i>Odontodactylus</i> Bigelow, 1893 : by I. Gordon (<i>British Museum (Natural History)</i>) | 183 |
| (20) Dr. Gilbert Ranson's application for the use of the name <i>Gryphaea</i> Lamarck for the Portuguese Oyster and Dr. L. R. Cox's counter-application for the use of this name for the Fossil species <i>G. arcuata</i> Lamarck, 1801 : comments by : (1) P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (<i>University of Sheffield</i>) ; (2) H. B. Stenzel (<i>University of Texas</i>) and Gordon Gunter (<i>Institute of Marine Science, Port Aransas, Texas</i>) ; (3) G. Lecointre (<i>Rabat, Maroc</i>) ; (4) S. Jaeckel (<i>Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität, Berlin</i>) ; (5) Jean Roger (<i>Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris</i>) ; (6) Harald A. Rehder, Joseph P. S. Morrison, R. Tucket Abbott, David Nicol (<i>U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.</i>) and Julia Gardner, W. P. Woodring, John B. Reeside, Jr., Ralph W. Imlay, L. W. Stephenson, W. A. Cobban (<i>U.S. Geological Survey</i>) ; (7) P. Korringa (<i>Ruksinstituut voor Visscheruonderzoek, Bergen op Zoom, The Netherlands</i>) ; (8) A. Chavan (<i>Thoiry, Ain, France</i>) ; (9) G. Mermod (<i>Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, Genève</i>) ; (10) H. A. Cole (<i>Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Fisheries Experiment Station, Conway, Wales</i>) | 185-192 |

Important Notice : Zoologists proposing to submit applications to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are requested to submit those applications, in duplicate and typed, double-spaced, on one side of the paper only, and with wide margins. Owing to lack of staff available for copying applications, not submitted in the foregoing form, preference for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* is necessarily given to applications submitted in the form requested.